

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 15 has been amended to further particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter regarded as the invention. Support for these changes may be found in the specification, such as in paragraphs [0074] and [0098], among others.

### The 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 15-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over a single reference Acres (US Patent 6,565,434) among which claim 15 is an independent claim. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended Claim 15 provides that:

“receiving from a remote device first configuration parameters for a first communication port and second configuration parameters for a second communication port;

in response to receiving the first configuration parameters from the remote device for the first communication port, configuring the first communication port ...

in response to receiving the second configuration parameters from the remote device for the second communication port, configuring the second communication port”

This is further provided in the Specification which states that the “ports on the multi-port communication board 514 may be reconfigurable. Thus, at one time, a first port on the multi-port communication board 514 may be configured as an asynchronous serial port and at a later time the first port may be configured as a synchronous serial port. Further, each port may be configured to transmit a different proprietary communication protocol from the gaming machine.” (Specification, paragraph [0074]).

Acres does not teach “receiving from a remote device first configuration parameters for a first communication port and second configuration parameters for a second communication port”, “in response to receiving the first configuration parameters from the remote device for the first communication port, configuring the first communication port” or “in response to receiving the

second configuration parameters from the remote device for the second communication port, configuring the second communication port” as claimed in amended Claim 15.

Accordingly, since Acres does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, it can not be said to anticipate the claimed invention. As to dependent claims 16-22, the argument set forth above is equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that the claims are now in condition for allowance. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited and Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER LLP

/Adrienne Yeung/  
Adrienne Yeung  
Registration No. 44,000

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
(408) 255.8001